

HV

741

.A21

018

VOL 23

# CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

NO 4 130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

~~COPY 2~~

VOL. XXIII, No. 4

## BULLETIN

APRIL, 1944

### Day Care, A Review of Organization and Administration

ALICE T. DASHIELL AND MARY KEELEY

THE large number of children who need some care and supervision outside their own homes due to the wartime employment of their mothers has for three years, held the attention of the general public and the interest of agencies and groups concerned with and responsible for the welfare of children. In spite of much activity in planning "Day Care" programs, there has been dissatisfaction with the quality of care and variety of services offered. There has been too little recognition of the child as an individual and too much preoccupation with a confused administrative structure.

#### Child Care Programs Unrelated to Need

The national picture in the provision of services for children of employed mothers is characterized by a serious lack of necessary services in some communities, under-capacity use in others, and over-expansion of certain types of service in a few. Exaggerated preliminary estimates of the number of children who would need care were so challenging that many programs of service were planned without a realistic evaluation of the kinds of care that children needed or that parents wanted and would use for their children. In some communities annoyance with the conflicts and confusion in developing the program led to a refusal to do anything, regardless of evidences of need for child care services.

#### Mothers are Working

The War Manpower Commission<sup>1</sup> states that women with young children should not be recruited for wartime employment until every other source of labor supply has been utilized, but supports the right

of the individual woman to decide whether or not she will enter employment. In actual practice, young mothers have been recruited and are often a preferred source of labor supply. Factors which have contributed to bringing mothers of young children into employment are:

1. Strong motivation for seeking wartime employment. The drafting and voluntary enlistment of fathers of young children for military service has produced both an economic and emotional need for employment, the emotional need arising out of the greater stake the young mother has in the war because of the military service of her husband, the future of her family, and the need for purposeful activity to tide her over the difficulties of separation. The economic need is obvious.

2. Skills and recent work experience which many young mothers have, and for which there is a demand. These women have been more recruitable than single women who have never worked.

3. Industry's traditional preference for young workers and the fact that certain war jobs require youth and strength.

4. The absence of any controls which would make other labor resources available and thereby eliminate the need to recruit mothers of young children. In practice, transfer of workers from non-essential to essential wartime production has come about because of the scarcity of certain materials or the desire to produce wartime essentials. Had national service legislation been passed early in the war it is possible that fewer women with young children would be working. It is doubtful if the passage of such legislation would decrease the number of young mothers employed at this time.

CONTENTS	
DAY CARE, A REVIEW OF ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.....	1
AGREEMENTS USED BY CHILD PLACING AGENCIES.....	4
EDITORIAL.....	8
INTERPRETER'S COLUMN.....	9
ADOPTION APPLICATION FORM.....	10
TEMPORARY SHELTERS.....	12
READERS' FORUM.....	14
BOOK NOTES.....	15

<sup>1</sup> War Manpower Commission, "Policy on Employment in Industry of Women with Young Children," as amended January 15, 1943.

Arguments for and against the employment of women with young children have too often been biased and unrelated to the realities of family life or current employment conditions. Most mothers of young children prefer to remain at home with their children, and very few will deny that this is the best plan for the child.

Unwise as we feel wholesale recruiting of mothers of young children for employment to be, thousands of such women are working. In peacetime many mothers found it essential to their own and their family's welfare to work. In wartime these same needs, plus the factors listed above, have driven more women into employment. Until this country undertakes to determine fully the availability of other sources of labor supply and faces some of the problems of the mother obliged to support a family on a military allotment, there will be many children who will need care and supervision during the hours the mother is employed.

#### Responsibility for Program Undefined

It seems to us that we have let the provisions of services for children of employed parents become more confused than it needed to be. The assumption that the existence of a "child care facility" would make possible full utilization of female labor resources failed to take into account the fact that mothers have heavy home responsibilities even if their children are cared for while they are at the plant or office. The lack of definite authority and responsibility for the development of child care services brought about time-consuming maneuvering by the many agencies and groups legitimately interested in the program. There have been wide differences of opinion on whether primary responsibility rested with federal, state, or local government; with industry, with private child care agencies, with educators, welfare, health, or recreation authorities.

In England the responsibility for developing a program of services for children of employed mothers was, early in the war, placed in the Maternal and Child Health Division of the Ministry of Health. The Board of Education was made responsible for care given in connection with the schools. In the United States agencies having similar responsibility but not the same control are the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor, and the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency. In this country we have failed to establish a comprehensive and well co-ordinated plan which would assure the provision of services sufficient in scope and quality to protect the children whose mothers are employed. This has

been due primarily to the use of makeshift measures, the reluctance to designate authority and responsibility, and failure to utilize fully and to develop existing child care resources.

#### Local Communities Without Adequate Funds

Early in 1941 the U. S. Children's Bureau and U. S. Office of Education began to study the need for child care services arising out of the wartime employment of mothers. Communities greatly expanded by war industry were unwilling and unable to establish necessary child care services without financial assistance and technical guidance. Federal funds were not made available to local communities through the federal, state, and local agencies concerned with child care and equipped to guide the program. To some extent, and inadequately, funds were made available through channels unrelated to child care and through use of funds originally intended for other purposes.

In July, 1942, approximately six million dollars of WPA money was earmarked for the purpose of adjusting the WPA nursery school program to meet the need of children whose mothers were employed. In December, 1942, the President ordered the WPA dissolved. The expanding WPA nursery school program was carried on through use of Lanham Act<sup>2</sup> funds originally intended for "Defense Housing" and "Defense Public Works" in war communities.<sup>3</sup> These measures placed control of federal funds for the program with the Federal Works Agency, which administered the WPA program and the Lanham Act and whose primary function was construction.

Lanham Act funds went directly from the Federal Works Agency to the local community for the construction, maintenance and operation of group care facilities. Simultaneously, federal funds available to the Federal Security Agency<sup>4</sup> by a grant from the Emergency Fund for the President went from the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor to state departments of education and welfare for personnel to plan, develop, administer and supervise the program. The unsettled and complicated federal program, the use of two distinct channels for

<sup>2</sup> Public Law 137—77th Congress. Also known as "Community Facilities."

<sup>3</sup> Six Lanham Act grants were approved prior to January 1, 1943: New Haven, Bristol, Middleton, Farmington, Connecticut; Wilmington, North Carolina; and Orange, Texas. As of February 9, 1944, the Federal Works Agency reported 2,243 centers in operation and caring for 65,772 children.

<sup>4</sup> Granted to the Office of Community War Services, Federal Security Agency (formerly Office of Defense Health and Welfare) to carry out the responsibilities placed upon the agency by Executive Order 8890 and WMC Directive IX.

the transmission of funds, the changing of administrative regulations governing the use of funds proved a barrier to efficient use of such federal funds as were available to local communities.

Directive IX of the War Manpower Commission, confirmed and implemented by executive order of the President, placed responsibility for "promoting and co-ordinating the development of necessary programs for the day care of children of mothers employed in essential activities" with the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services.<sup>5</sup> Study of the federal program by this agency and other interested agencies led to recommendations which were presented to Congress as Senate Bill 1130 (the Thomas Bill). This bill sought to authorize a federal appropriation to aid states to provide services for children of mothers employed in war areas. It placed responsibility for federal administration with the Federal Security Agency (Office Community War Services and Office of Education), and the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor; provided a comprehensive program of service; and the machinery with which to utilize all existing resources for child care. This bill was passed by the Senate in June, 1943, and referred to the House Committee on Education. Though repeatedly requested to consider the bill, there has been no hearing by this committee nor any indication that the bill will be reported to the House. Therefore, the only federal funds available for services for children of employed mothers are Lanham Act funds, administered by the Federal Works Agency. A 115 million dollar deficiency appropriation<sup>6</sup> has just been made available to the FWA, a part of which will be used to carry on the currently operating child care program and extend it to other communities in need of such services. This may not be the best way of providing child care services, but it is the only source of federal funds for setting up and operating "day-care" centers.

#### Local and State Agencies Should Exercise Responsibility

In the United States, federal agencies do not have jurisdiction over the programs of state or local departments of education, health, and welfare, but are set up to assist in developing programs and standards for the various services. It is consistent, therefore, to indicate that the chief responsibility for the care and protection of children should continue to rest with local and state agencies. In most states there is provision for the licensing and supervision of child caring agencies, institutions, and often foster family homes by the state or local departments of welfare and health. The sole exception to this, in states which

<sup>5</sup> Since April, 1943, Office Community War Services of Federal Security Agency.

<sup>6</sup> First Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1944.

have such provision, are the child care facilities under educational auspices and hence supervised by local and state departments of education. Attempts to develop a program of service for children of employed mothers without regard for the responsibilities of any or all three of these departments, weaken the structure of the program and increase the possibility of setting up of substandard emergency measures.

Currently full responsibility for determining need, initiating development or extension of services, and making application for federal funds rests with the local community. Localities which have had personnel sufficiently experienced to plan a sound child care program and resources with which to fill in the gaps in the present federal program have been fortunate. Where the local community has not been able to do this, services for children of employed mothers have been and are grossly inadequate. In several states, departments of education, welfare and health have extended their services to provide local communities with much needed technical leadership. Some states<sup>7</sup> have appropriated state funds for day care services and others<sup>8</sup> have made money available through the State Defense Council. The extension of state assistance to local communities should be encouraged, because it would help to assure provision of adequate service in areas of greatest need. Private child caring agencies, private schools, labor unions, industry and civic groups have much to contribute if they are given a chance to participate.

Many local communities have long established resources which can be adapted and expanded to meet the day care needs of children. These resources include the plants, personnel and programs of day nurseries, nursery schools, social settlements, other recreation agencies, housing projects, schools and churches, and the personnel of both public and private welfare, education, health and nutrition services.

In planning a comprehensive service to meet the needs of children of all ages for part-time care, it is advisable that there be an integration of all available resources. Such planning should be focused upon the well-being of the *children*, would combine the resources of federal, state, and local agencies in a unified program, and would provide a wide range of services and contributions.

Consideration of two fundamental questions may help to clarify our thinking and encourage the development of better quality and a better integration of services. These questions are: How can a child's need for security, health protection, and an opportunity to grow and develop best be met in day care programs? By whom can needed services be supplied most efficiently? These two questions will be discussed in the May issue of the Bulletin.

<sup>7</sup> New York, Washington, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, California.

<sup>8</sup> New Jersey is a good example.

## Agreements Used By Child Placing Agencies

MARY RUTH COLBY

Social Service Division, United States Children's Bureau

**I**N THE fall of 1942 the co-operation of the Children's Bureau was enlisted by the Child Welfare League of America to obtain information from child placing agencies about the current use of agreements with foster parents when a child is placed with them for either temporary or permanent care. Information was also obtained about agreements made with parents when an agency accepts a child for care. Agreements may be either written or verbal but serve a common purpose—clarification of the rights and responsibilities of the parties involved in the proceeding.

### Agencies Included

Information was obtained from 26 child placing agencies, as well as three state welfare departments. Each of these three state departments had a program for the supervision of child placing agencies and child caring institutions and agencies and conducted a direct care program which included child placing. In one state the direct care program was co-ordinate with other activities of the Children's Division of the State Department of Public Welfare; in another state the state institution for dependent children placed children in foster homes subject to the advice and general supervision of the Division for Children; and in the third state, the child placing activities formerly maintained by the state institution for dependent children had been made the direct responsibility of the Children's Division.

The response received indicated that the subject is one in which there has been a lively interest. Only one agency failed to respond to the inquiry requesting information. One state department assumed responsibility for obtaining information about the practices of eight private agencies under its general supervision. Altogether, information was obtained from 30 private agencies and three state departments. Fourteen agencies were operating state-wide programs in the following states: California, Delaware, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, New Jersey, North Dakota, Virginia and Wisconsin. Sixteen private agencies were conducting their activities within a restricted area composed of a single city or county located within one of the following states: Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Thirteen of the 30 private agencies reporting had a plan for agreements with foster parents at the time

adoptive placements were made; three of these also had prepared agreements for use when temporary placements were made. Six agencies followed a special plan with either verbal or individualized written agreements, and ten had developed no plan, although four of these were considering the advisability of doing so.

Two of the state departments had prepared a form for an agreement to be used by the child placing agencies under their general supervision, but the third state department had no plan even though 47 children had been placed by the department during the fiscal year ended September 30, 1942.

### Written Agreements

A statute enacted in Virginia in 1932 made it mandatory for every child placing agency placing a child in a foster home to enter into an agreement with the foster parents by which authorized representatives of the placing agency were permitted access to the child and the home at all times. In addition the foster family agreed to release the child to the agency representative whenever in the opinion of the agency or the State Commissioner of Welfare the interests of the child required this.

Accordingly, one Virginia agency had developed two agreement forms which it considered quite satisfactory, one for boarding placements and one for adoptive placements. The general secretary of the agency reported that formerly the same agreement had been used for both types of placement with such interlineations and changes as were necessary, but this proved unsatisfactory. When the present forms were evolved, a definite attempt was made to word the agreements so they would provide a "valid and binding contract" but would still not contain the legal terminology usually found in contracts drafted by attorneys.

The following form had been accepted for use following placement of a child in an adoptive home:

We, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ after careful consideration receive into our home \_\_\_\_\_, a ward of the \_\_\_\_\_ of Virginia.

We will give this child a free home, assuming complete financial responsibility for his care, maintenance and education with the intention of adopting him if we find him to be a child whom we want to make permanently ours.

We will not, however, commence court proceedings for the adoption without the consent of the Society, and we understand

that the Society cannot consent to adoption until the child has lived with us for one year, and that the consent of the Society may be withheld after the expiration of such year if, in the opinion of the Society, the best interests of the child will be benefited thereby.

We understand that we may return the child to the Society at any time prior to adoption should we find him not a child whom we can consider as our own, but we will give the Society sufficient notice of our intention to allow other arrangements for his care to be made.

We understand that a representative of the Society will visit us and the child from time to time during the period prior to adoption and that this representative may be called on by us for consultation. We also understand that the Society has the right to remove the child from our home at any time prior to adoption should it be considered necessary for the best interests of the child.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Foster Father

Foster Mother

Representative of the Society

Date \_\_\_\_\_

The following form has been used by the same agency when a child was placed in a home for boarding care:

We, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ residing at \_\_\_\_\_ receive into our home \_\_\_\_\_, a ward of the \_\_\_\_\_ of Virginia.

1. We understand that he will remain with us for a temporary period, the length of the period to be determined by the \_\_\_\_\_ Society and that we will receive board from the Society for his care at the rate of \$\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_.  
2. We understand that a representative of the Society will visit us and the child from time to time and that the Society may be called on by us for consultation at any time.  
3. The Society has the right to remove the child from our home at any time, whenever, in the opinion of the Society, the best interest of the child shall require it. We, also, may return him to the Society should we find him a child unsuited to our home.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Foster Father

Foster Mother

Representative of the Society"

Date \_\_\_\_\_

The tone of these two agreements is very different from that found in an agreement used by a New York agency which was drafted by agency attorneys a number of years ago:

In consideration of being entrusted with a child by the \_\_\_\_\_, we hereby acknowledge that it shall be on the following conditions to which we, jointly and severally, agree, said conditions having been formulated by the \_\_\_\_\_ from its experience as necessary for the welfare of the child:

1. To hold said child at the pleasure of the \_\_\_\_\_ at all times prior to receiving the formal consent of said \_\_\_\_\_ to the formal and legal adoption of said child, and to return any child entrusted to us by the \_\_\_\_\_ on demand therefor made prior to legal adoption of the said child.  
2. To give the child the best physical, mental and moral care possible according to our financial means, including \_\_\_\_\_ religious training.  
3. To bring up the child in the \_\_\_\_\_ religious faith.  
4. To notify said \_\_\_\_\_ of any change in our residence or address.

5. Not to institute any adoption proceedings without a formal written consent of said \_\_\_\_\_ to the said adoption.  
6. Not to institute any adoption proceedings except such as shall be approved by counsel in New York for the \_\_\_\_\_ and not to file any such proceedings nor to allow to be filed in our behalf or in behalf of either of us any document (including the proposed decree) unless such document has been approved by counsel for said \_\_\_\_\_.  
7. To furnish said \_\_\_\_\_ free of charge with a duly certified copy of any adoption proceedings instituted by us.  
8. To pay a reasonable charge for having any adoption proceedings proposed by us examined and passed upon by counsel for the \_\_\_\_\_.  
9. On request of the \_\_\_\_\_ to institute adoption proceedings in the County of New York, State of New York and to prosecute same to final conclusion, if counsel for said \_\_\_\_\_ advises that in his or their opinion adoption proceedings in the state of our residence would be of doubtful validity or inadvisable.  
10. To pay the premium charge or charges of any surety company on any bond given by the \_\_\_\_\_ that may be required by the laws of the state in which we reside either on account of our having received the child or on account of the \_\_\_\_\_ having entrusted a child to us or that may be required by said laws or by the courts of said state as a condition precedent to the adoption of said child.  
11. To pay the costs and expenses, if any, involved in any necessary legal proceedings to be instituted by the \_\_\_\_\_ to obtain legal custody of the child to be entrusted to us.

Husband \_\_\_\_\_

Wife \_\_\_\_\_

Notarial Seal

An Illinois agency has prepared an agreement form that has met its need quite satisfactorily. This is used only for boarding home placements and for the few free home placements made by the agency. The executive of the agency reported it had been found very helpful, particularly when foster parents attempted to prevent removal of a child when the Society considered this for the best interests of the child. This agreement, like that used by the Virginia agency quoted above, expresses the joint responsibility of the agency and the foster parents:

The \_\_\_\_\_ Society in accepting your home as a foster home expresses its confidence in you and in your ability to meet the needs of our children and to cooperate with us. In order to avoid any misunderstandings, the following agreement is drawn up to clarify our respective responsibilities.

The \_\_\_\_\_ Society social worker will visit your home and the child regularly and will be ready to give any service needed for his or her welfare.

We, the foster parents, agree as follows:

We are responsible to the \_\_\_\_\_, herein-after called the Society, for the child's care, and we agree to relinquish the child only to a representative of the Society or someone authorized by the Society. The Society may resume the custody of the child at any time when in its judgment such action will be for the best interest of the child.

If for any reason we cannot keep the child or properly care for him, we shall notify the Society immediately and give the Society sufficient time to make other plans.

We shall not take the child outside of the city without consulting the Society.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA BULLETIN

April, 1944

We shall notify the Society immediately of any illness of the child or of any serious illness of any member of our own family.

We shall notify the Society of any change of our address or any change in the membership of our family.

We shall incur no expenditure without authorization from the Society if reimbursement is expected.

**Foster Father**  
**Foster Mother**  
**Street Address**  
**City**

Name of Agency

It was not the policy of this agency to use a written agreement with prospective adoptive parents. Instead, the adoption policies of the agency were made available through agency publications and in letters sent to the foster parents after their application was taken under consideration. A two-page mimeographed statement which included the adoption practices of the agency as approved by the "case committee" in 1941 was given to the foster parents.

This statement set forth the philosophy of the agency with regard to adoption, interpreting to the foster parents the adoption standards and the safeguards it had set up for both the child and the foster family.

A Minnesota agency had accepted an agreement form prepared by the State Department for the agencies under its supervision. Although the wording here is more legalistic than may be altogether desirable, the agency reported the agreement had proved to be distinctly advantageous, particularly when there was a question about the procedure for providing medical care and when dealing with attorneys who were advising the foster parents to institute adoptive proceedings before the end of the prescribed residence period:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

This agreement by and between \_\_\_\_\_ residing  
at \_\_\_\_\_ name of agency  
city or town, county, state  
first party, and \_\_\_\_\_ residing at \_\_\_\_\_  
name of foster parents city or town

WITNESSETH, That in consideration of the agreement herein made by the second party, the first party places in the home of the second party \_\_\_\_\_ born \_\_\_\_\_ name of child \_\_\_\_\_ birth date placed \_\_\_\_\_ date of placement \_\_\_\_\_

The terms and conditions of the placement shall be as follows:

That the child shall receive adequate and necessary medical and surgical care.

That the child shall be on trial for adoption for at least one year

—  
—  
—

It is agreed that the first party shall have access at all reasonable times to the child so placed and to the home in which the child is living. The second party agrees to relinquish to the first party all custody and right to said child whenever in the opinion of the first party or the State Department of Welfare such relinquishment is essential to the best interests of the child.

The second party reserves the right to return the child to the first party at any time within one year from the date of this agreement.

The second party agrees to receive the child into his family; to provide adequately for his care, support and education.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this

\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
First Party

In actual practice the agency reported it had assumed the cost of medical care or surgery when this was of an unusual nature and the condition was one of which the agency was aware prior to placement. Otherwise the foster parents were expected to abide by the placement agreement provisions.

Two agencies—one in Kansas and one in North Dakota—had included a type of agreement on the blank used for an application. The Kansas agency had not used the term "agreement" but instead had prepared an "understanding between agency and foster parents." The respective responsibilities of the agency and the foster parents were clarified in a statement by which the foster parents agreed to notify the agency of any change of address, to treat the child as a member of the family, to bring the child up knowing he is a foster child, to send the child to church and Sunday school, to send the child to school and to high school if his ability warrants this, to reimburse the agency for transportation costs for the child to and from the home and for an escort if necessary, not to surrender the child to a third party or remove him from the state without the consent of the agency, to assume full responsibility for the child "in health or in sickness" as long as the child remains in their care, and to give the agency thirty days' notice if they wish to return the child. The agency reserved the right to visit the child, to make such requirements as the interests of the child demand, and to remove the child if at any time his safety or well-being require this. A brief statement at the end of the application blank of the North Dakota agency was little more than a statement of the agency's responsibility as guardian of the child with an authorization for the agency to visit the child "at any time" prior to legal adoption.

## **Verbal and Individualized Written Agreements**

For the most part, New England agencies reported that no formal contract or agreement was used but instead the agencies dealt individually with the foster

parents. In occasional instances a specially drafted written agreement was drawn up in accordance with the particular circumstances of the case in point. Such procedure may be as satisfactory as a printed agreement form, particularly when few placements are made. Few of the New England agencies reporting on this practice had placed more than 10-15 children a year.

The executive of one of these agencies explained it was made clear to the foster parents that the child was being placed with them with the expectation that the agency would consent to legal adoption at the end of a year's residence period, and would assist with the adoption if this seemed desirable. Although it was explained that the child was expected to remain under the social and medical supervision of the agency during the trial year, it was occasionally agreed that the medical supervision be given by the family pediatrician. The foster parents were told that the agency had authority to remove the child during the year's trial period but that this was rarely necessary. It was also explained that legal adoption would not be urged if the foster parents had any question about the suitability of the child for their home; indeed it was made clear to the adoptive parents that the interests of the child would best be served by their frank admission that the child had not proved suitable. In the opinion of this executive a careful investigation of the foster home, together with a thorough study of the attitudes of the prospective foster parents was the most effective method to prevent the necessity for a change of plan following placement. No strong convictions were expressed as to the advantages or disadvantages of this plan over a more formal agreement, but it was the belief of the executive that case work with foster parents probably resulted in a more satisfactory basis for understanding than even the most carefully drawn formal document.

A sectarian agency in Minnesota likewise reported that a signed agreement was not required but that considerable time was spent with prospective foster parents on the first interview and subsequent interviews when the problems and responsibilities of both the foster parents and the child placing agency were discussed. It was explained to the foster parents that their signatures on an application indicated an understanding of their responsibilities toward both the child and the agency. The purpose of the residence period was also interpreted so that the foster parents would clearly understand that this served as a protection to them and to the child.

#### No Plan for Formal Agreement

Although ten agencies and one state department reported no special plan for agreements with foster parents, a New Jersey agency reported the staff had discussed this and were generally agreed that a formal agreement might help to prevent misunderstanding. Their experience, like that of several other agencies reporting, showed that foster parents who take children to board with the distinct understanding that the child will not be available for adoption sometimes became so involved emotionally that serious problems developed in their efforts to force the agency to consent to an adoption.

The executive of a Massachusetts agency explained that although prospective parents were not requested to sign an agreement before a child was placed with them, the agency visitor discussed the relationship of the agency to the child and the prospective parents and frequently this was confirmed by a letter restating the fact that the child was, until legal adoption was completed, a ward of the agency and could be removed from the home if this seemed to serve the best interests of all concerned. On the other hand, the prospective adopting parents were assured that the agency would resume responsibility for planning if the placement did not seem desirable for either the child or the foster parents. The executive further expressed an opinion that in an agency with many staff members and consequent staff changes, it might be wise to have a formal agreement signed by the adoptive parents.

Even though it is recognized that an agreement alone will not prevent emotional entanglements, it will stand as a tangible reminder of the child's status in the foster home. When the agreement is supplemented by frequent supervisory visits to the foster home by a visitor alert to evidences of the development of an undue emotional attachment to the child, help may be given to the foster parent and plans can be made for the child accordingly.

The state department reporting that no agreement with foster parents had been considered necessary, said no misunderstandings had developed from this practice.

#### Other Types of Agreement

A Massachusetts agency sent, in addition to its agreement with foster parents, a copy of the boarding agreement made with a mother at the time her child was accepted for care. An outstanding advantage of

(Continued on page 13)

---

BULLETIN

---

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

Henrietta L. Gordon, *Editor*

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

---

### Some Present Needs\*

**I**N CONTRAST to prewar days we find, in many communities, the supply of foster homes and even the space available in institutions for dependent children to be less than needed. Frequently this situation has been reported to the Child Welfare League of America, and our staff have observed that in certain cities the situation has become critical. The reality of this need, whatever its proportions, has stimulated an unprecedented concern over the child who must live away from his own home or who in fact has no home of his own.

The situation could be reviewed more exactly if only there had been on December 31, 1943, the usual decennial enumeration of children receiving foster care in family homes and institutions. But for economy it was omitted and we find the proudest country in the world too poor to count, once in ten years, its dependent and neglected children.

The rates of board paid foster mothers has been increased somewhat in proportion to the increase in cost of living. For too many years, however, foster home care has been advocated as being cheaper than care in institutions. We have been content to keep it too cheap and to make foster mothering much less attractive than a dozen other occupations. Rates of board in foster homes should be doubled in many communities, and until such a change is made we will be morally obliged to recognize foster mothers as so many benevolent maternal volunteers instead of women whose services are essential and requiring compensation.

The salaries of house parents in institutions also are being increased. But again we practiced a false economy in child care and entered the war with salaries for this difficult service for the most part at miserably low levels. To improve the situation, many of the salaries should be doubled. And indeed, to retain even incompetent workers, most institutions have substantially increased salaries.

\* Excerpts from a statement by Howard W. Hopkirk, Executive Director, submitted to the Commission on Children in Wartime, March 17, 1944.

The economics of foster care has been influenced as never before by a marked increase in contributions paid by parents of children under care. Many agencies are receiving twice as much income from this source, which usually has been one of the minor sources of support. Furthermore, there are parents who are able to pay whatever may be the entire cost of a child's care. This situation has three important aspects: first, parents receiving higher wages are able to pay amounts which previously would have been impractical or impossible; — second, we find that parents from an economically more privileged group are turning to social agencies because the agencies in recent years have developed service of a quality which is well worth paying for; third, such parents are seeking foster care due to problems other than dependency and they will be exacting in ways not frequently encountered in our previous experience. It is probable that children's institutions and child placing agencies are entering an era when the best of them will pass through an experience similar to that through which hospitals passed forty or fifty years ago. In the Nineteenth Century hospitals were not patronized by those who could afford to keep their relatives at home because of the inferior service to be found in hospitals, where many of the patients died and where mostly paupers were served. We who have lived most of our years in the Twentieth Century are not aware of the revolutionary change in the attitude of Americans toward hospitalization.

Development of foster family day care has lagged. Yet here may be found one of the most practical of all the services now provided for children. Those responsible for the care of children under two years of age will be guilty of serious blundering if they develop widespread institutional day care for infants instead of spending the same money and effort for promotion of day care in family homes. One woman in her own home can take care of two little children. In staffing a nursery for children under two years of age it is desirable to have the ratio of one worker to two, or at the most, three children. Thus there is no saving in womanpower by throwing these babies together in nurseries, and we may expect epidemics resulting from such developments which will be avoided or reduced by use of family homes. The emotional deprivation which generally results from group care of infants also is a hazard.

Consistent improvement of these and other services for all children, whatever their race and creed, will reflect that vitality which we Americans consider our heritage. If we allow the interest in such developments to wane, we may well feel concerned both for our children and our country.

—HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

### The Interpreter's Column

*Every month, the National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, 130 East 22d Street, New York, N. Y., discusses the contents of the BULLETIN from the standpoint of its possibilities for community education.*

Miss Dashiell and Miss Keeley, in their article "Day Care, A Review of Organization and Administration," pull together for us the confused story of the care of children of working mothers. It isn't a pretty story, and it brings us face to face with our own failings. But let us waste no time in mourning. Even with a bad beginning, the job is still there to be done.

Of course, no one can predict what the situation in relation to women in industry will be in the next few years. We hear of industries laying off workers; we hear of women who have tried jobs and given them up. Whether we have reached the peak of the drafting of fathers over twenty-six remains to be seen. We do know however, that in the group of younger men being drafted now there are hundreds of fathers of very young children; we know that women, in unpredictable numbers, will be staying in industry after the war, and we have the irrefutable fact that thousands of women are in industry right now, with our job of helping them provide for their children still not accomplished.

All in all, we have no reason to relax and say regrettably that we have done an inadequate job of arranging for day care but that the need is past and we hope to have better luck next time. The need is not past.

We are up against a job of reinterpretation and to reinterpret a program is much harder than to interpret it in the beginning. Two years ago day care centers were "hot news." Their news value is much less now, because editors and radio station managers and even the general public are a little weary of them. The returning veteran, the problem of the demobilized war worker which will soon be upon us, and a number of other current problems are much more likely to make page one these days. Also, we have in many communities an irritation and antagonism to work against, as is always true when a job has been done less than well. All this is not to say that the job of reinterpretation can't be done. It is to say, however, that it will require ingenuity, a fresh point of view, a scrapping of much of our old interpretation materials, and an eagle-eyed look at what we do from here on to make sure that we are not making the same old mistakes. Growing out of our mistakes in the past are the following rules to guide us in our interpretation from here on in:—

We must interpret on the basis of the facts. Our

failure to have the facts at hand, or at least an authoritative prediction on the situation, caused us to interpret somewhat wildly in both the direction of understatement and overstatement, with the result that some communities over-developed facilities which were unused while others failed to develop adequate facilities.

We must take parents into the problem, even where the hour for this seems late. By failing to take them into the initial planning stages we lost not only their invaluable help in setting up services, but we lost the priceless opportunity to interpret the services to them so that they could interpret to others and guide us in our own approach to other parents.

In writing booklets, folders, announcements, posters and other materials to go directly to prospective users of the centers we must keep our audience better in mind. Too often, in the past, we have presupposed that every parent understood what we were talking about when we offered them "skilled supervision for their children in an adequately equipped day care center." Skilled supervision sounds fearsome, and they have never heard of a "day care center" before. We must not "talk down" to parents and sound, as some of us have in the past, as if we had no respect for the desire and ability of parents themselves to plan for their children. Too often we have been in the position of taking over the situation completely and "doing things for people" as if the people were helpless.

We must put more warmth into our publicity programs for day care centers. Parents want to be convinced that not only will their child's health and habits be supervised but that they will be supervised by people who like children.

We must realize that we are reaping the fruit of years of inadequate interpretation about what the needs of children really are, and we must do something about it. People cannot use day care centers intelligently, and communities cannot plan them wisely if they do not know what it means to a child and to parents to be separated for long hours during the day. As Miss Dashiell points out, in the Reader's Forum, the public doesn't even realize the difference between a day care center and a nursery school, because we have assumed that people instinctively know what the problems of little children are. In the future, we must do a great deal more teaching than we have done in the past, and we must forever forsake the idea that our "publicity program" consists solely of telling the public about our agencies. People must be told about *children*, and our agencies come into the publicity picture only as we explain how we meet, or want to meet, the problems of those children.

—SALLIE E. BRIGHT  
Executive Secretary, National Publicity Council for  
Health and Welfare Services

## Adoption Application Form

*The League now has available for sale an application form for parents wishing to adopt a child. This form, to be issued after a personal interview, was developed by a committee of five from adoption agencies in League membership. It was tested through use during a period of about three months, by 26 League member agencies one of whose functions is adoption. The form now ready for release has incorporated the practical suggestions that came from this trial period. It was anticipated that no form can be at once so discriminating and yet all inclusive as to be universally applicable. For some agencies this form will serve as is, for others it may serve as a basis for the development of a form more uniquely their own. Some of the committee's thinking is here presented.*

IT WAS not possible to separate a discussion of adoption policies from the discussion of forms. We noted that different agencies use the application blank at different phases of the adoption process and therefore with different meaning for the client. Some agencies present the application in the first contact, others as the final step of the home study.

### The Use of Application Blanks

The use of the application blanks depends upon the intake process, that is, the agency's procedure in working with applicants. Agencies that accept applications for children from very wide areas and who therefore generally have some correspondence with the applicant before an appointment is made for the first interview or before an opportunity is made available for a personal discussion about a child, may use a form which is simple and brings to the agency enough information to serve as a basis for initial selectivity or screening, and for determining next steps. Some agencies do this via a request for a letter written by applicant which is to give brief information about the family and leaving it to the family to decide what information they will submit at this point. Other agencies use a more formal application blank or form which will be attached. This form would request information which would clear up questions of immediate concern, such as the possibility of the family's coming into the office for an application interview, at the present time about draft status or location of husband, etc. The war situation has made it advisable to emphasize such points. These are variables determined by existing social conditions and agency situations.

Other agencies send on what is in essence a simple application. This asks such information as directions for reaching the home, reasons for wishing to adopt a child, some indication as to the type of child wanted, and signature of husband and wife, and would omit the specific questions as to the current situation of the man which would make possible or impossible the consideration of that family at the present time. In

other words, the policy is that anyone may file an application who asks for it.

Agencies which precede the giving of an application with preliminary interviews may use a more comprehensive type of application which can serve also as the face sheet of the adoptive home's record. Such a more comprehensive form may be used as a questionnaire at a later stage of the application process by agencies which used the simpler form earlier in the process. This simpler form is often used at the end of the application process rather than at the beginning. Essentially the difference between the use of the simple form and the more comprehensive form is this: that the comprehensive form calls for information much of which is part of the discussion in the interviews, and serves both the agency and the family as a basis for considering whether they will go on with adoption plans. There is feeling that no family should be asked to fill out a blank asking so many questions before there has been very real discussion of the questions involved. Such a questionnaire, application form, or face sheet-information form, however it may be called, generally carries with it the implication that both the agency and the applicant are more ready to consider seriously the placement of a child, a readiness to proceed to the home study. Agencies that use such a form as a questionnaire might use it when both the applicant and the agency have arrived at a point where they are ready to consider the actual placement of a child.

Two concerns were brought to light: (1) that the original application should not make such demands on the family as would lead them to feel that the acceptance of such an application by the agency is in a measure a commitment for actual placement, and (2) that the questionnaire should carry the weight and importance in the information solicited as would be consistent with the material covered during the course of the study and the gravity of the responsibility of the placement of a child.

The Committee expressed grave concern over the layman's interpretation of the filing of an application

with an adoption agency. When a family gives as much of itself to a process as is involved in filing a comprehensive application, it has the right to assume an obligation on the part of the agency to either place a child with the family or to notify them of their inability to place a child. Current practice is varied among agencies. There has been mutual confusion on the part of both agency and the public as to whose responsibility it is to follow up the application. In many agencies it is interpreted as lack of interest on the part of the applicant if she fails to continue to keep in touch with the agency about the progress of her application, and so the application may be suspended periodically. On the other hand, communities expect the agency to take all the responsibility, some families being reticent rather than disinterested. Our present thinking is that because of lack of staff and because of the original presumption that our services are not in terms of the families that want children but rather in terms of the number of children who need placement, this problem can best be met through shared responsibility. It should be made clear to the family, therefore, that they are free and should feel free to communicate their continued interest periodically to the agency.

The Committee raised it as a question to be explored further if it may not become the responsibility of the agency to notify the family at the end of some stated period of time whether their application will continue to be held because there is hope of their wants being fulfilled, or not.

#### Content of Application Form

With regard to what should go on the application blank, there was complete agreement that the material should give an all-over picture of the factual situation, much in the manner of face sheet information. If the applicant is quite comfortable during the interviews, he would probably answer any details asked for on the application form freely and with lessened resistance. The committee questioned the value of any questions on the application that would be likely to arouse anxiety. For most data there should be a space for separate answers by husband and wife. There seems to be no value in requiring a statement of motives for adoption on the application, since that is the focus throughout the study. It is helpful to have recorded physical characteristics such as height, weight, color of eyes and skin. Education should include grammar school, high school, and any other training, including professional or vocational. In the case of a previous marriage terminated by either death or divorce, it did not seem essential to

ask for names so long as dates were given. Because of war conditions resulting in tremendous shifts in employment, we did not recommend going into any previous work history, but limited the information on this subject to present employer, either self or other, with amount of salary noted as well as income from other sources and amount of insurance carried. A space for names and addresses of references, including also a doctor and a priest, minister or rabbi, would come at the end. The name of a near relative should also be asked for, not because he would necessarily be used during the investigation process, but because it might be of value in later years in case of research or an attempt to trace an adopted child.—H. L. G.

#### Group Boarding Homes Is This a Trend?

A STATE department in discussing some war created problems and services tells us that there is a new development in connection with certification of boarding homes. They are being called upon "to certify a much larger number of what we call private group homes, that is, where a private family takes a large number of children. This, of course, is not classified as an institution but rather is certified as a group boarding home." In one sense this is not a new story. The country has been startled innumerable times by tales of "baby farms" which in essence were "group private homes."

A natural tendency to think in symbols would lead us to be shocked by this revelation. We know that group living multiplies the problems of child care. Organization and administration of a "group unit" calls for a good deal of skill. Furthermore, such a set-up lends itself all too easily to unspeakable neglect of children. And yet the shortage of foster homes is raising the question of the use of temporary homes and shelters used for limited periods of time and children who can benefit by such a group experience. Many questions want to be answered. A few that come to mind quickly are, how many children can it care for and still be a group home, not an institution? Does this home have adequate facilities? Is it staffed with enough adults to insure adequate care? Is it located in a community which has facilities for the social, educational and health needs of the children? These few questions at once indicate that in truth there is but one important question and that must be answered before a certificate is issued. Are such group homes under responsible agency auspices? It would seem to us that that would be the only way to insure the kind of administration and supervision necessary to safeguard the well-being of the children.

—H. L. G.

## Is There a Need for More Temporary Shelters for Children?

*We reprint this from The Advocate, organ of the New England Home for Little Wanderers, and invite discussion, suggestions and reports from other local experience.*

In Massachusetts for many years child-caring organizations have depended largely, sometimes entirely, on foster families. In the New England Home we have a full knowledge and the highest appreciation of the great values of the foster family for the child who for good reasons cannot live in his own family. From long experience in the use of foster families, however, we realize there are hazards and that one of the worst risks in the use of the foster family as a means of caring for all dependent children in a community is that the demand may exceed the supply. When this happens, one of two things is apt to happen—either there will be overloading all along the line, or children who need foster care will not get it. When we use the expression "overloading," we do not especially mean placing too many children in the foster family, although this does sometimes happen, but we mean the tendency towards working too fast in finding and determining the quality of the foster family, in making placement, and in making the necessary visits after placement. Under present-day conditions we find ourselves asking whether we are not at the point in Massachusetts where we should have in various parts of the Commonwealth more small shelter institutions or homes to be used for temporary care of children.

The private agencies are, we say honestly to the public here and now, not taking care of all the emergency cases which come to their doors. Some of them come because of war conditions—the father is working in some industry where he is needed for long hours absolutely every day, the mother falls ill or dies and no housekeeper can be found, and the children should have immediate shelter and care until a plan can be worked out; maybe the situation is reversed and the father is ill and the mother needs to work for a time; maybe there is a sudden death of one parent or the other. Many good reasons bring these children to the attention of the agencies, and because so many women are employed in war industries it is not possible to employ a housekeeper to take charge of the child's own home, and for the same reason there are fewer foster families available. For example, in the area of Berkshire County, where we have our Branch Office, the General Electric employs thousands of women who before the war were at home, some of whom would be serving us as foster mothers. We

have increased and intensified our efforts to find new foster families, but, while we have succeeded in finding a few, the number is not sufficient to meet the need. In Berkshire County, after careful consideration by the Board of our own branch agency, the Council of Social Agencies, the Community Fund, and finally the United War Fund, we decided to open a shelter for temporary care, that we might not be forced longer to refuse care to some children who in grave emergency were at our doors. The United War Fund granted some money, a bank has given us rent free for the duration of war a satisfactory building in an accessible location, and we have found a staff.

We shall study our experiment carefully. We are asking the question whether we should not have more such small homes or shelters in the Greater Boston area, as well as in other parts of the Commonwealth. Certainly there will be no dividends in neglecting these children if there is any validity in our claims that we are protecting the "home front."

The problem is further enlarged and intensified by the situation of the Division of Child Guardianship. Recently the Commissioner of Welfare and the Director of the Division of Child Guardianship (a part of the Department of Welfare) called some of us to the Commissioner's office in the State House and confronted us with the fact that the Division receives by commitment from all parts of the State something over one hundred children every month, and the children are coming faster than foster families are available. This is not an increase in the number of children, but a decrease in the number of foster families available. The Director stated that the temporary shelter homes which the State has been using are overcrowded and urged a need of homes for these children.

Here is a problem which should be faced by all our communities. If we find a need for care under excellent auspices, we believe there should be opened certain small institutions or temporary shelter homes for children. This does not mean that we should be careless in taking children into care. Every known social service skill should be employed to keep the child in his own home. This does not mean any failure of the full appreciation of the values of foster family care. When good, it is the very best thing for the dependent child. When it is poorly done, it is possible for it to be worse than even an inadequate institution. Foster family care is the great resource for our dependent children. We must, and no doubt will, continue to use it to the full. It should not, however, be made a fetish. We honestly know that we have never had a sufficient number of adequate foster families

for all the dependent children of the Commonwealth. We begin to know that some children for a period thrive well in group care. Let the one-track disciple of foster family care only, re-read the report of one of the committees of the 1930 White House Conference, under the chairmanship of the late J. Prentice Murphy, one of our greatest leaders and teachers in the foster-family-care field. This report, under Mr. Murphy's direction, declared that we should do away with the "foster-family-care versus institution idea," and call all care of children away from their own homes "foster care," and realize that sometimes one would have to be used and sometimes the other, and sometimes—from the standpoint of the child—institutional care might be indicated as best for a limited period.

The New England Home happens to have a small institution in Boston. We know who is ringing our doorbell these days, and we are forced to say to the public that during the past three months we have been unable to give care to some children who desperately needed care. Some child-caring societies without an institution are asking us to board some of their wards through emergencies at a per diem rate. We do not have room. If there were a large and adequate house in a good location made available to us we would be tempted to open another small institution and shelter for the duration. We believe we could get the staff, and the necessary funds would not be too great. In fact, the prospect is that board paid by parents and guardians would meet half the expense if we did not have to pay rental. In 1940, when we were charged with the responsibility of housing British evacuee children, a number of real estate "white elephants" were offered. Maybe someone will offer one to American children who also, in a sense, are the victims of a war situation.

### Agreements Used by Child Placing Agencies

(Continued from page 7)

this agreement was the inclusion of the mother's consent signed in the presence of a witness:

1. For the customary physical examination by a physician authorized by the agency.
2. For hospital care in case conditions arise which require this.
3. For administration of anesthetic and performance of an operation if the agency's physician advises such procedure.
4. For use of necessary tests and immunizing treatment to prevent diphtheria, smallpox, etc.

A Delaware agency reported the only written agreements used at the time of placement by the

agency were: (1) the written request by the mother of a child for placement in a foster boarding home until such time as another plan was made, and (2) a medical release. The first form stated that:

(a) it was understood any new plan for the child would be discussed between the agency and the mother,

(b) the mother was to be responsible for contributing as much as she was able toward board and clothing for the child, and

(c) the agency would be responsible for medical care during the period of placement.

It was said that the advantages of this form were chiefly psychological for although it was not binding, it crystallized the decision of the parent to place the child and an acknowledgment of her responsibility for contributing toward the cost of the child's care.

The medical release clarified for the parent the kind of medical care the agency might wish to give the child and thereby gave an opportunity for any expression of opposition before the child was accepted for care. The signature of the parent on this form likewise gave the agency some protection in the administration of its medical program, even though it was not binding legally.

A Georgia agency submitted the following surrender signed by a parent at the time of release of a child for adoption.

Georgia \_\_\_\_\_ County  
 I, the undersigned, mother of \_\_\_\_\_ being the sole legal parent and therefore having complete parental control, and being solicitous that said minor child \_\_\_\_\_ born \_\_\_\_\_ and now \_\_\_\_\_ of age, should receive the benefits and advantages of a good home, and the Society being willing to receive and provide for the said child a home with its advantages to the end that said \_\_\_\_\_ may be best fitted for the requirements of life, and I, the undersigned mother, being financially and otherwise unable to provide for my child, consent to this surrender.  
 I, the undersigned, being mother of the aforesaid child, hereby surrender the said child to Society and in consideration of the benefits guaranteed by the said Society to thus provide for the said child, I hereby relinquish all rights and claims to the said child. And I (his)  
 further agree not to seek to effect (her) removal from the home or (he)  
 homes in which (she) may be placed by the said Society.  
 I further agree that said Society, if they so desire, may claim for the said child a legal adoption according to the provisions set by the Society.

Witness my hand and seal this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 1944

Witnesses

Mother

A Massachusetts agency that had adopted no plan for a written agreement with the foster parents submitted an agreement made with the child's mother at the time a child was accepted for placement in a foster home. This was primarily a financial agreement with the agency, but in addition the mother con-

sented to the "customary physical examination" and gave permission "for the administration of an anesthetic in case of emergency or any necessary inoculations."

### Conclusions

The information received from the agencies shows quite conclusively the variety and lack of uniformity in the practices followed. The type of form used and the ways in which it is used reflect the differences in case work policy and practice. The whole subject is probably sufficiently important to warrant careful consideration of all its pros and cons by the child placing agencies. Each agency should determine for itself:

- (1) The purpose an agreement will fulfill in protecting the interests of the children it places;
- (2) Whether this purpose can be accomplished through some alternative plan and, if so, what such a plan should be; and
- (3) The circumstances under which it is probable that a formal agreement will be of value in protecting the future of the child, as well as the interests of the foster parents.

Following individual action by the child placing agencies, it would possibly be helpful for the state department of public welfare in each state to initiate joint meetings to discuss this whole question.

### READER'S FORUM DAY NURSERY OR NURSERY SCHOOL?

HERE have been many requests for an explanation of the difference between a day nursery and a nursery school.

Recently an agency wrote:

"We believe that information which shows a distinction between a 'Nursery School' and a 'Day Nursery' will be of help to the office of the Attorney General, in deciding the question as to whether or not this so-called 'Nursery School' is subject to license by our Board as a 'Day Nursery,' or whether there is reason for it to function as a free lance, because it is conducting a program which it regards as strictly that of a nursery school."

We therefore decided to present to our readers, our thinking on the distinction.

The question raised by the organization calling itself a nursery school, as to its right to operate without a license and to be considered as a school rather than a day nursery indicates a confusion which we find in many communities. The difficulty arises from a lack of comprehension of the problems for children involved in a day long separation from parents and home.

Many nursery schools which were organized primarily as part day programs offering group experi-

ence and a developmental opportunity have extended their hours in the war emergency because of the need to provide all day care. Many of these nursery schools have failed to recognize that the extension of hours involving the separation of children from their families actually alters the focus of their program and changes the function from an educational process to that of day long, substitute parental care.

A nursery school offers a rich learning experience for a child within a short period each day, after which home care is resumed. The degree of separation is of lesser consideration.

A program operating eight hours or more daily, although it should include a nursery school program is established for the purpose of providing care for children during a large proportion of their waking hours. It is not therefore essentially an educational program, since it deals with the problems of the partially broken home, problems stemming from separation from the parents.

—A. T. D.

### Standards for Selection of Personnel

*No problem is more troubling today than how to select personnel capable of giving skilled service during the period of acute shortage of professionally trained persons. The following statement of principles issued by the Members of the Wartime Committee on Personnel should serve executives and trustees as a guide. It is excerpted from an article entitled "Personnel-Training-Recruiting" appearing in the March, 1944 issue of The Compass.\**

In view of the fact that the quality of social work personnel is the primary determinant of the quality of social work service, and because there is a need of a guide to measure this quality the following standard should be used in selection of personnel for social work positions:

Persons in social work positions, especially those in war created agencies are confronted in their work with responsibilities relating to the lives and affairs of others in such a way as to require important safeguards in the public interest. These safe-guards may best be insured by the selection to social work positions of persons whose preparation includes successful completion of two years of professional study in a graduate school of social work.

It is recognized that under present conditions this goal cannot be realized and it is necessary to deviate

\* Publication of the American Association of Social Workers.

from it. The following principles should be applied in deviating from the above standard:

**1. Selection of personnel**

- a. Agencies employing social work personnel should have prepared, in as specific terms as possible, classifications of (1) responsibilities for which highly trained technical staff are needed, (2) responsibilities for which individuals, who have had some training but who do not qualify for No. (1) can be used, and (3) responsibilities for which untrained staff can serve during the war emergency. Recruiting, employment and assignment activities should be related to the above job classifications.
- b. Workers educationally qualified but with less than full professional training should be given an opportunity to continue actual training and practice with a selection of carefully planned social work courses, through work study, educational leave, and other appropriate plans.
- c. In the employment of persons who do not meet minimum professional social work qualifications emphasis should be placed on selection of individuals with desirable personal qualifications and, whenever possible, on selection of those persons who are educationally eligible to obtain graduate professional training.
- d. Social work experience under the supervision of a qualified social worker should be given priority over other kinds of experience in employment of individuals who do not meet the minimum qualifications. Such experience should not, however, be considered a substitute either for professional education or eligibility for such.

**2. Maximum utilization of staff resources**

- a. Programs for staff development, including practical in-service training and reclassification of personnel to allow for the maximum utilization of staff resources in doing the agency's work, should be continued.
- b. In appropriate situations where untrained personnel, persons who have not completed their training, and trained workers have been employed to perform similar duties, additional means should be provided in terms of salaries, opportunities for promotion, as well as opportunities for further training for the purposes of distinguishing personnel meeting certain qualifications of professional training from those without such qualifications. At the time of employment in fairness to each individual, the agency should make clear what his responsi-

bilities and the opportunities for future advancement shall be in the light of his qualifications.

- c. Responsibility for supervision of untrained personnel or workers who have not completed their training should be on the highest possible level and directed toward helping workers to develop their capacities to the utmost in performing their jobs.
- d. There are many persons in related fields who possess skills which may be of value in doing some social work jobs. In the employment of these persons there should be a clear understanding on the part of the agency regarding the use that can be made of whatever skills a worker has at the point of employment without affecting the recognized function of the agency.

---

### National Conference

THE National Conference of Social Work will be held in Cleveland, Ohio, May 21-27, 1944. The chairman of the program of the Child Welfare League of America is Mrs. Marguerite Y. Gauchat, Executive Secretary, The Children's Bureau of the Family Service Society of Canton, Ohio. This program includes ten sessions on planning and practice in the various aspects of child welfare.

The League's headquarters will be at the Hotel Statler.

Printed copies of our program, naming subject, speaker, date and place, have been distributed. Those who have not asked for a copy may still do so.

A new case record exhibit will be available.

---

### BOOK NOTES

**CHILD DEVELOPMENT: PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL GROWTH THROUGH THE SCHOOL YEARS.** By Marian E. Breckenridge, M.S. and E. Lee Vincent, Ph.D. W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1943. \$3.25.

This book of fifteen chapters, an excellent bibliography, and an adequate index is intended as a text for students in psychology, teacher training, home economics, medicine, nursing, and social work, as well as for parents. The authors "urge college teachers not to use this book as a text alone, but rather as a focus for vigorous class discussion of experiences and observations made by the students." It is my opinion that that is the only way this book could be

successfully used as a text. The book has the advantage of presenting certain controversial material, although in general it presents accepted findings and viewpoints in the child development research field.

From some of the chapter headings one can gather the scope of the book: Some General Principles of Development; Interrelatedness of Growth; Influences on Growth; Growth and Use of the Body; Growth of Sense Perception and Judgment; Development of Memory; Growth of Language; Social and Personality Development; and A Summary of Growth Achievements. The book tends to stress the physical factors in the growth and development of the child although the social and psychological factors are not overlooked. Its weakness lies in the field of the emotional factors. True, there has been much less research work in, and it is more difficult properly to evaluate, emotional factors but justice is hardly done to present day knowledge of inter-personal parent-child, and child-child emotional relationships. In fact, in my opinion this failure fully to take into account and adequately to discuss the emotional factors conditioning growth and development is the one weakness of this excellent treatise. In discussing masturbation, for example, the authors hint at an all too common cause—disturbed parent-child relationships—and then state, "This latter is a rather delicate area for a parent conference but one can at least suggest a greater demonstration of affection and somewhat more frequent praise of the child's efforts; perhaps less punishment." Yes, one can so suggest but that does not get at the cause of the problem and hence is ineffective in treatment. The necessity for regular bowel movement is unduly stressed. On page 27, for example, there occurs the following: "An inquiry about the amount of time allowed for the *important morning* bowel movement revealed that his mother did not know if or when he had his *daily* movement. She is not to be *too seriously condemned* for this . . ." (italics mine).

There are, however, many passages the reviewer would like to quote approvingly but space forbids. The discussion of maturation and its effects on learning is a topic in point. There is a tendency at work today to send children to school at an ever earlier age. Therein lies the grave danger that these early years will be given over to academic, 3R, pursuits.

All in all this is an excellent book on child development which deserves to be widely read and studied.

—DR. HENRY C. SCHUMACHER

Director, Cleveland Guidance Center, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio

EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG CHILD: A NURSERY SCHOOL MANUAL.  
By Catherine Landreth and K. H. Read. John Wiley & Sons,  
N. Y., 1942. \$2.50.

This timely book gives a composite picture of nursery school practice in an almost ideal situation. In the first part, the authors trace the evolution and growth of the nursery school from its early beginnings in the day nursery field, through its various phases to the establishment of research nursery schools in universities.

There is a description of the physical set-up of the nursery school of the University of California, where Dr. Landreth is director. The types and kinds of equipment, its arrangement and its importance when planning a school for young children, is clearly explained. Diagrams of the indoor and outdoor arrangement of the nursery school of the University of California help the reader to understand the need for and to visualize the proper use of space in the care of the two to four-year-old child.

The second part of the book deals with the education of the pre-school child. In a clear, concise manner, the value and use of certain techniques in the teacher-child relationship are explained. These techniques are illustrated by examples of their successful use. The routines—sleeping, eating, elimination, dressing and washing—are discussed in a manner that enables the reader to readily grasp the proper place of the teacher in these learning situations. In the chapter devoted to motor development some very excellent illustrations are given and here again the place of the teacher in helping the child to develop motor skills is clearly defined.

The reader is directed to the importance of experiences in the child's learning processes and the ways and means of providing experiences through such various media as music, art, excursions and by having pets in the school. The authors tell not only of the value of these experiences to the child but also discuss techniques and methods by which they may be presented so that the child is a participant instead of an unwilling bystander in an adult initiated activity.

While many of us do not have the facilities of Dr. Landreth's school, yet the sound fundamental principles of her methods may be applied in any pre-school program.

Originally intended as a text book for nursery school teachers, this book may be profitably read by any one interested in the welfare of the young child. It should prove a valuable addition to the shelves of agencies concerned with child care, as a reference book for all members of the staffs.

—URMA DEBUS

Director, North Side Day Nursery, St. Louis, Mo.